



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

## The Women's Litany.

By Ina Duvall Singleton.

From battle (which is murder) and from strife,  
From needless, wholesale waste of human life  
Deliver us, who cry for help to Thee—  
Oh! Lord of Hosts, hear Thou our litany!

For in those mighty armies that are hurled—  
Each on to each, as one would loose the chain  
That binds dread beasts—to battle until slain,  
Is one—within those ranks, each man—(a pawn  
'Twould seem to those who, battling, set them on)—  
Each fighting man leaves one behind to mourn.

For every man who dies to give  
His life, that England's freedom live;  
For every man who yields his dower  
Of strength, to strengthen German power;  
For every man who hails the chance—  
"A glorious death for glorious France!"  
For every man, some woman waits!

The mothers, who have borne proud pain,  
That by their travail earth might gain  
Her sons, and then their lives have spent  
To rear them—Lord, these women meant  
For peaceful age—see! now they wait!  
What part have they in that great hate  
That sets men battling? Yet, they wait!

The wives who on these men depend;  
The wives whose husbands should defend  
Them from the hardships, cares of life;  
If there be glory in this strife,  
No glory do they share who wait,  
Deserted, sorrowing, desolate!  
Look, Lord, in pity!—See! they wait!

The children—helpless, innocent—  
For whom a father's care was meant;  
Bereft of that, they stand alone—  
Can victory for their loss atone?  
Behold these children, Lord! They wait!—  
Till men their blood-lust satiate—  
For sires who may not come, they wait!

From pestilence, from famine, from each shape  
Of horror that stalks after, in war's wake,  
Deliver us, who cry for aid to Thee!—  
Lord, God of Hosts, hear Thou our litany!

## The Moral Responsibility of the United States for the Continuance of the War.\*

By Rev. William Weston Patton.

In a recent issue of *The Outlook* (March 3, 1915) was an article by Dean Charles Noble Gregory setting forth two arguments for the continuation of the export of munitions of war by neutrals to combatants. These two arguments were, first, that the practice was according to international law, and, second, that it tended to preserve peace by better maintaining the "balance-of-power" policy. The article opened with the following sentence: "Neutrals have been wont to yield their freedom of trade and commerce very grudgingly to the restraints and predatory tactics of war."

Dean Gregory could not have given a better epitome than that of the United States' attitude toward the pres-

ent war in Europe. We may or may not have been under moral obligations to have raised a protest in the first stages of the war against the violation of international law and sacred treaties. That is a question upon which there is an honest difference of opinion. Most of us are happy to say that at any rate we are not yet involved in the war.

But, on the other hand, when we become strong enough mentally and morally to rise above the application of the standard of dollars and cents to all things and actions, it does seem a little strange that we as a nation felt no promptings to protest in those early days when the "almighty dollar" was not involved, and that now, when the violation of international law begins to touch our pocket-books, we do feel so prompted.

The world today is too closely knit together by the various means of modern science and communication for one nation with good grace to refuse to shoulder its share of the burden of the common weal of neutral nations during such a war as this, when such a nation is not immediately affected, and then to suddenly lift the strong arm in the name of "all neutrals" when its own pockets are touched. We may truly be moving within the fields of international law in making our recent protests to England and Germany regarding their declarations toward neutral trade, but in so doing we are standing upon very different ground from that upon which we stood last August.

And since the growing feeling of many Americans has found expression in the resolution of Senator La Follette asking for a congress of neutral nations to consider, among other matters, the prohibition of the sale and export of arms by neutral manufacturers to the war combatants, this self-interested interpretation of international law has taken a new turn. Dean Gregory's article gives able expression to this turn.

Many people, however, feel differently, and the author wishes to submit a few thoughts along these other lines.

Dean Gregory believes that we should not cease to export munitions of war. His first argument, the author takes it, is that this practice of exporting arms falls within the well-established customs of international law—that we have a perfect right to do so. He points out that international law has passed through various stages of development until it has reached the present, under which license is granted to a neutral to export arms to a combatant. Granted that law is developing. Then it is time that it developed beyond the present condition where such license to export is allowed.

This whole question comes under a higher stage of development of international law than we have yet reached in the letter of the law—the stage of *moral* international law. It is not a question of what we have a right to do as neutrals under international law. It is a question of what we are morally bound to do above and beyond international law. No one can deny that manufacturers have a right under international law to cease exporting arms. No one can deny that Mr. Clarence H. Howard, of St. Louis, president of the Commonwealth Steel Co. of Granite City, Ill., had a right to refuse to fill an order of \$2,000,000 for shells because he believed in the peace principles. No one can deny that if public opinion demands that exports shall cease we can make a law to that effect. We have erred already

\*A reply to Dean Charles Noble Gregory's article in *The Outlook* of March 3, 1915, entitled "Should Neutrals Refuse to Sell Arms to Warring Nations?"